

RELATIONAL MOTIVATION FOR CONFORMAL OPERATOR ORDERING IN QUANTUM COSMOLOGY

Edward Anderson¹

DAMTP, Centre for Mathematical Sciences, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WA.

Abstract

Operator-ordering in quantum cosmology is a major as-yet unsettled ambiguity with not only formal but also physical consequences. We determine the Lagrangian origin of the conformal invariance that underlies the conformal operator-ordering choice in quantum cosmology. It is particularly naturally and simply manifest in relationalist product-type actions (such as the Jacobi action for mechanics or Baierlein–Sharp–Wheeler type actions for general relativity), for which all that is required for the kinetic and potential factors to rescale in compensation to each other. These actions themselves mathematically sharply implementing philosophical principles relevant to whole-universe modelling, the motivation for conformal operator-ordering in quantum cosmology is substantially strengthened. Relationalist product-type actions also give emergent times which amount to recovering Newtonian, proper and cosmic time in the various relevant contexts. The conformal scaling of these actions directly tells us how emergent time scales; if one follows suit with the Newtonian time or the lapse in the more commonly used difference-type Euler–Lagrange or Arnowitt–Deser–Misner type actions, one sees how these too obey a more complicated conformal invariance. Moreover, our discovery of the conformal scaling of the time involved permits relating how it simplifies equations of motion with how affine parametrization simplifies geodesics.

PACS: 04.60.Kz, 04.60.Ds

¹ ea212@cam.ac.uk

1 Introduction

1.1 Relationalism and Product-type actions.

Classical physics is usually taken to follow from difference-type actions¹

$$I = \int d\mathbf{t} \int_{\Sigma} d\Sigma \{T_{\mathbf{t}} - V\} . \quad (1)$$

Here, $T_{\mathbf{t}}$ is the kinetic terms that is usually² homogeneous quadratic in the velocities,

$$T_{\mathbf{t}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\Gamma, \Delta} M_{\Gamma\Delta} \frac{dQ^{\Gamma}}{d\mathbf{t}} \frac{dQ^{\Delta}}{d\mathbf{t}} , \quad (2)$$

where $M_{\Gamma\Delta} = M_{\Gamma\Delta}(Q^{\Lambda})$ is the kinetic metric of the configuration space and $V[Q^{\Lambda}]$ is the potential term.

However, classical physics can also be taken to follow from product-type actions

$$I = 2 \int d\lambda \int_{\Sigma} d\Sigma \sqrt{TW} . \quad (3)$$

Here, T takes the form

$$T = \sum_{\Gamma, \Delta} M_{\Gamma\Delta} \circ Q^{\Gamma} \circ Q^{\Delta} / 2 , \quad (4)$$

$\circ = d/d\lambda$ and λ is a label-time, and $W[Q^{\Lambda}]$ is minus the potential (possibly up to an additive constant energy, as explained in the examples below). Action (1) leads to action (3) by, firstly (parametrization): adjoining $\mathbf{t}$ to the configuration space so that $d\mathbf{t}/d\lambda$ now features in it. Secondly, provided that V is independent of $\mathbf{t}$ and $dQ^{\Gamma}/d\mathbf{t}$, which can be held to be the case when one is considering fundamental classical physics of the universe as a whole, Routhian reduction [3] subsequently serves to eliminate $d\mathbf{t}/d\lambda$ from the variational equation for $\mathbf{t}$.

Product-type actions have advantages over difference-type actions for consideration of whole-universe fundamental physics – the setting for quantum cosmology. Product-type actions arise if one sets up physics from the Leibniz–Mach–Barbour relational first principles, which both have philosophical significance and are sharply mathematically implementable. Relationalism provides an alternative foundation for physics to absolutism; which of these to use has been the subject of a long debate [4, 5], and relationalism would appear to have a good case for use in whole-universe situations. I use relationalism in this Leibniz–Mach–Barbour’s sense of the word [5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11]; see [12] for Rovelli’s distinct use of the same word and [21] for a brief comparison of the two. The Leibniz–Mach–Barbour relational first principles are as follows.

A physical theory is *temporally relational* if there is no meaningful primary notion of time for the whole system thereby described (e.g. the universe) [6, 9]. This is implemented by using actions that are *manifestly reparametrization invariant* while also being free of extraneous time-related variables (such as external Newtonian time or the geometrodynamical formulation of general relativity (GR)’s lapse coordinate [13]).

A physical theory is *configurationally relational* if a certain group G of transformations that act on the theory’s configuration space Q are physically meaningless [6, 9, 14, 1, 15, 16]. As subcases, this includes *spatially relational* and *internally relational* (in the usual gauge-theoretic sense) depending on the mathematical form and physical interpretation of G . Spatial relationalism suffices for the examples covered in this paper.

It is temporal relationalism that is directly tied to the product-type actions in this paper; the reparametrization invariance of these actions is clear since changing from λ to another λ' clearly cancels as T is homogeneous quadratic. Indeed, one could implement temporal relationalism, rather, in a *parametrization irrelevant* way (i.e. one which makes no reference whatsoever to any label-time parameter λ):

$$I = 2 \int \int_{\Sigma} d\Sigma \sqrt{W \sum_{\Gamma, \Delta} M_{\Gamma\Delta} dQ^{\Gamma} dQ^{\Delta} / 2} . \quad (5)$$

Starting from product-type actions, using a $\mathbf{t}^{\text{JBB}}$ (‘Jacobi–Barbour–Bertotti time’) [7, 17, 18, 10] such that

$$d/d\mathbf{t}^{\text{JBB}} = \sqrt{W/T} \circ = \sqrt{W} d / \sqrt{\sum_{\Gamma, \Delta} M_{\Gamma\Delta} dQ^{\Gamma} dQ^{\Delta} / 2} \quad (6)$$

is *found* to considerably simplify the equations of motion that follow from the relational principles. In this sense such a $\mathbf{t}^{\text{JBB}}$ is a privileged parametrization; it *coincides* with the conventional difference action’s $\mathbf{t}$, but is now to be considered as *emergent and provided by the entirety of the model universe’s contents*.³

¹ Σ is the notion of space of extent (3-space for field theories and trivial for particle theories, for which $\int_{\Sigma} d\Sigma$ is taken to become $\times 1$). Q^{Λ} are generalized coordinates with Γ a multi-index over particle and/or field species as well as over space of extent. I use round brackets for functions and square brackets for functionals.

²One can include a sufficient set of fields in this context to study classical fundamental physics (there being no difficulty [1, 2] with additionally incorporating terms linear in the velocities into this scheme and this paper’s workings, e.g. permitting fermionic as well as bosonic matter coupled to GR.

³Barbour furthermore considers [7, 10] this to be the timestandard such that isolated observers who choose to use it obtain clocks that march in step with each others’. However, as I have never seen this quantitatively demonstrated, it will play no further part in this paper.

A further point of note is that product-type actions' reparametrization invariance gives as a primary constraint

$$N^{\Gamma\Delta} P_{\Gamma} P_{\Delta} / 2 + \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{E} , \quad (7)$$

which is quadratic in the momenta. [Here $N^{\Gamma\Delta}$ is the inverse of $M_{\Gamma\Delta}$.]

1.2 Examples of product-type actions

Example 1) The Jacobi action [3] for the Newtonian mechanics of N particles with positions $\underline{q}_I$, $I = 1$ to N is

$$\mathbf{I}_{\text{Jacobi}} = 2 \int d\lambda \sqrt{\mathbf{T}\{\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{E}\}} . \quad (8)$$

Here

$$\mathbf{T} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{I=1}^N m_I \{\circ q_I\}^2 , \quad (9)$$

$\mathbf{U}(Q_{\Lambda})$ is minus the potential term, $\mathbf{V}$, and $\mathbf{E}$ is the total energy of the system. [3] lucidly covers how to obtain this from $\mathbf{I} = \int dt \{\mathbf{T}_t - \mathbf{V}\}$ by Routhian reduction. (I use t in place of $\mathbf{t}$ for mechanical theories). For the recovery from (8) of the usual Euler–Lagrange formalism from this but with the emergent t^{JBB} now taking over the role of Newtonian absolute time, see e.g. [7, 17]. The quadratic constraint is in this case the energy constraint $\sum_{I=1}^N p_I^2 / 2m_I + \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{E}$.

Example 2A) One could consider versions of the Jacobi action for ‘relational particle mechanics’ theories in which the velocities come with arbitrary Euclidean [6, 7, 8, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25] or similarity [15, 26, 20, 27, 16, 21, 28, 29, 30, 25] group frame corrections⁴

$$\circ_g Q^{\Delta} \equiv d_g Q^{\Delta} / d\lambda \equiv \circ Q^{\Delta} - \overrightarrow{G_{\circ g}} Q^{\Delta} \quad (10)$$

that implement spatial relationalism as well, so that one is considering mechanical theories that are temporally *and* spatially relational. The quadratic constraint continues in this case to be an energy constraint of the form in the preceding example. Now one is to use d_g/dt in place of d/dt in (2), $\circ_g$ in place of $\circ$ in (4, 8) and $d_g Q^{\Gamma}$ in place of dQ^{Γ} in (5) and (6). Also, variation with respect to the auxiliary variables g produces constraints that are linear in the momenta. For Euclidean relational particle mechanics, these are $\underline{\mathbf{P}} = \sum_{I=1}^N \underline{p}_I = 0$ (zero total momentum for the model universe) and $\underline{\mathbf{L}} = \sum_{I=1}^N \underline{q}_I \times \underline{p}_I = 0$ (zero total momentum for the model universe), while similarity relational particle mechanics has these again alongside $\mathbf{D} = \sum_{I=1}^N \underline{q}_I \cdot \underline{p}_I = 0$. By analogy with Example 3 below, relational particle mechanics are additionally useful models [31, 32, 33, 34, 27, 17, 18, 35, 36, 37, 38, 28, 24] for the Problem of Time in Quantum Gravity [32, 39] and other issues of interest in Quantum Cosmology [40, 41, 42].

Example 2B) Relational particle mechanics can be cast in reduced form in spatial dimension 1 or 2. Here all the above constraints can be eliminated, producing reduced kinetic terms of the form

$$\mathbf{T}^{\text{red}} = M_{\Gamma\Delta}(Q^{\Lambda}) \circ Q^{\Gamma} \circ Q^{\Delta} / 2$$

for $M_{\Gamma\Delta}$ the usual metric on $\mathbb{S}^{N-2}$ for N particles in 1-d and the Fubini–Study metric on $\mathbb{CP}^{N-2}$ for N particles in 2-d. The quadratic constraint is still an energy constraint of form (7) built from inverses of the above-mentioned metrics.

Example 3A) An action (see e.g. [9, 2]) for a geometrodynamical formulation of GR [in terms of 3-metrics $h_{\mu\nu}(x^{\omega})$ on a fixed topology Σ , for simplicity taken to be compact without boundary; x^{ω} are spatial coordinates] is

$$\mathbf{I}_{\text{GR}}^{\text{BFO-A}} = 2 \int d\lambda \int_{\Sigma} d^3x \sqrt{h} \sqrt{\mathbf{T}_{\text{BFO-A}} \{\text{Ric}(h) - 2\Lambda\}} . \quad (11)$$

Here,

$$\mathbf{T}_{\text{GR}}^{\text{BFO-A}} = \mathcal{M}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \circ_{\text{F}} h_{\mu\nu} \circ_{\text{F}} h_{\rho\sigma} / 4 , \quad \circ_{\text{F}} h_{\mu\nu} \equiv \circ h_{\mu\nu} - \overrightarrow{\text{Diff}_{\circ\text{F}}} h_{\mu\nu} = \circ h_{\mu\nu} - \mathcal{L}_{\circ\text{F}} h_{\mu\nu} , \quad (12)$$

where $\mathcal{M}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} = h^{\mu\rho} h^{\nu\sigma} - h^{\mu\nu} h^{\rho\sigma}$ (the GR configuration space metric, alias inverse of the undensitized DeWitt supermetric [40]), Diff is the group of 3-diffeomorphisms on Σ , $\mathcal{L}_{\circ\text{F}}$ is the Lie derivative with respect to the ‘velocity of the frame’ F_{μ} , $\text{Ric}(h)$ is the Ricci 3-scalar corresponding to $h_{\mu\nu}$, h is the determinant of $h_{\mu\nu}$ and Λ is the cosmological constant. This action would be the better-known Baierlein–Sharp–Wheeler (BSW) [43] one if the kinetic term were, rather, $\mathbf{T}_{\text{BSW}}$ which is the same up to being built out of shift corrections $\beta^{\mu}(x^{\omega})$ in place of ‘velocities of the frame’ $\circ\text{F}^{\mu}(x^{\omega})$.⁵ However it would not then be manifestly temporally relational. Moreover, the BSW action is equivalent to the even more familiar ‘Lagrangian ADM’ [45] action,

$$\mathbf{I}_{\text{GR}}^{\text{L-ADM}} = \int d\lambda \int_{\Sigma} d^3x \sqrt{h} \alpha \{ \mathbf{T}_{\text{ADM}} / \alpha^2 + \text{Ric}(h) - 2\Lambda \} \quad (13)$$

⁴Here, $\overrightarrow{G_{\circ g}}$ is the group action corresponding to an infinitesimal group generator $\circ g$; note that this notation extends from the current relational particle mechanics context of the current example to the GR case of Example 3 as well.

⁵There are various other equivalent pairs of Principles of Dynamics objects in this paper that are related to each other by the one using auxiliary frame velocities where the other uses auxiliary coordinates (and, sometimes additionally, auxiliary *instant* velocities, $\circ\mathbf{I}$, in place of of auxiliary lapse coordinates, α). For details of how the equivalence of each of these pairs works out, see [44].

(for T_{ADM} taking the same form as the above T_{BSW}). The former follows from the latter by elimination of the Lagrange multiplier coordinate lapse α from its own variational equation. Parallely [44], one can also obtain the BFO-A action from a now also-unfamiliar action that is the Lagrange-ADM's equivalent pair in the sense of footnote 4,

$$I_{\text{GR}}^{\text{A}} = \int d\lambda \int_{\Sigma} d^3x \sqrt{h} \circ I \{ T_{\text{GR}}^{\text{A}} / \{ \circ I \}^2 + \text{Ric}(h) - 2\Lambda \} \quad (14)$$

(for T_{GR}^{A} taking the same form as $T_{\text{BFO-A}}$). The former now follows from the latter by using Routhian reduction to eliminate $\dot{I}$ (an even closer parallel of the equivalence at the end of Example 1 than the preceding coordinate elimination). The quadratic constraint is now the GR Hamiltonian constraint $\mathcal{H} \equiv \mathcal{N}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \pi^{\mu} \pi^{\nu} / \sqrt{h} - \sqrt{h} \{ \text{Ric}(\mathcal{M}) - 2\Lambda \} = 0$ for $\mathcal{N}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ the inverse of $\mathcal{M}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ (i.e. the undensitized DeWitt supermetric itself), while the linear constraint from variation with respect to F^{μ} is the GR momentum constraint, $\mathcal{L}_{\mu} \equiv -2D_{\nu} \pi^{\nu}_{\mu} = 0$.

Example 3B. Each of the pairs (11, BSW) and (13, 14), A become indistinguishable for minisuperspace. Therein, $\mathcal{M}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}(h_{\gamma\delta}(x^{\omega}))$ collapses to an ordinary 6×6 matrix $M_{\Gamma\Delta}$ or further in the diagonal case (a 3×3 matrix $M_{\Gamma\Delta}$) – the ‘minisupermetric’.

1.3 Banal-conformal invariance of product-type actions and its consequences.

In Sec 2, I start at the classical level, both to set up the foundations for the paper's principal quantum cosmology operator ordering issue and also to consider a second classical issue concerning parametrization of dynamical curves. In considering these two applications together, I follow Misner's Hamiltonian treatment [46]; my work differs from his in considering the Lagrangian formulation and the Jacobi formulation, which sits on relational first principles.

I show that product-type actions are preserved under the simple and natural *banal conformal transformation*

$$T \longrightarrow \tilde{T} = \Omega^2 T \quad , \quad W \longrightarrow \tilde{W} = W / \Omega^2 \quad . \quad (15)$$

This makes the kinetic factor a banal-vector and the potential factor a banal covector. Moreover the first of these can be viewed as

$$M_{\Gamma\Delta} \longrightarrow \tilde{M}_{\Gamma\Delta} = \Omega^2 M_{\Gamma\Delta} \quad , \quad (16)$$

so that the kinetic metric is a banal-vector. It immediately follows from the above banal transformation that the emergent timefunction can be regarded as a banal covector. If one then considers this scaling property to carry over to the difference-type action formulations' timefunction, a more complicated manifestation of banal-conformal invariance is discovered for difference-type actions. Clearly, performing such a transformation should not (and does not) affect one's classical equations of motion. Moreover, working through how the scaling of T , W and the timefunction conspire to cancel out at the level of the classical equations of motion reveals interesting connections between the simplifying effects of using the emergent timefunction on the equations of motion and those of the rather better-known affine parametrization [47, 48]. Section 2 ends by preparing for quantization by discussing how momenta, constraints and Hamiltonian-type objects banal-scale.

If one then (Sec 3) wishes for this banal-conformal invariance – displayed simply and naturally by relationalism-implementing product actions for whole-universe fundamental physics – to continue to hold at the *quantum* level, then this alongside the otherwise theoretically-desirable (and fairly standard) requirement that one's quantum theory should not depend on how Q is coordinatized, then one is led to the operator ordering for $N^{\Gamma\Delta}(Q^{\Lambda})P_{\Gamma}P_{\Delta}$ that is based on the conformally-invariant modification of the Laplacian. The latter requirement is due to DeWitt [49] (see also [46, 50, 51, 52]), and is true for 1-parameter family of scalar operators

$$\nabla^2 - \xi \text{Ric}(M) \quad (17)$$

where $\text{Ric}(M)$ is the Ricci scalar corresponding to the configuration space metric $M_{\Gamma\Delta}$ and ∇^2 is the Laplacian,

$$\nabla^2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \frac{\nabla}{\nabla Q^{\Gamma}} \left\{ \sqrt{M} N^{\Gamma\Delta} \frac{\nabla}{\nabla Q^{\Delta}} \right\} \quad . \quad (18)$$

Here, ∇ denotes partial derivative for finite theories and functional derivative for field theories and $\sqrt{M} = \sqrt{\det(M)}$. The conformal ordering, which fixes a particular value of ξ , had been previously suggested by e.g. Misner [46], Halliwell [53], Moss [54] and Ryan-Turbiner [55], albeit without any reference to the immediacy of this in product-type actions which themselves rest on the relationalist first principles. Additionally, Kuchař [50] and Henneaux-Pilati-Teitelboim [51] have advocated the Laplacian ordering itself ($\xi = 0$). So have Page [56], Louko [57] and Barvinsky [58], however their specific examples are 2-dimensional, for which the Laplacian and conformal orderings coincide. Wiltshire advocates both [42]. Christodoulakis and Zanelli [59] consider the case with an arbitrary ξ , as do Hawking and Page [52], albeit the latter then also pass to a 2-d example for which ξ drops out. Finally, all of these orderings coincide to $O(\hbar)$ [58].

The reason why arguments for such a choice of operator ordering is of interest is the well-known physical as well as just formal inequivalence of different operator orderings, so that how to make such a choice is a major issue in Quantum Gravity and Quantum Cosmology [49, 40, 46, 50, 51, 52, 59, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 32, 39, 55, 60]. Thus my answer that relationalism and coordinate invariance combine to imply the elegant and mathematically well-distinguished conformal ordering should be of considerable interest. In being revealed to possess philosophical foundations of this kind alongside the technical advantages already found in the above-cited papers, I argue that the case to adopt the conformal ordering is considerably strengthened.

2 Banal invariance of product-type actions, and classical consequences

The equations of motion that follow from the spatially relational generalization of (3) are the momentum–velocity relations

$$P_\Gamma = \sqrt{W/T} M_{\Gamma\Delta} \circ_g Q^\Delta \quad (19)$$

and the Euler–Lagrange equations

$$\circ \left\{ \sqrt{W/T} \circ_g Q^\Gamma \right\} + \sqrt{W/T} \Gamma^\Gamma_{\Delta\Lambda} \circ_g Q^\Delta \circ_g Q^\Lambda = \sqrt{T/W} \nabla^\Gamma W + M_{\Delta\Lambda} \sqrt{W/T} \circ_g Q^\Delta \nabla^\Gamma \{ \vec{G}_{O_g} Q_\Lambda \} \quad (20)$$

(for $\nabla^\Gamma \equiv \nabla/\nabla Q_\Gamma$ and $\Gamma^\Gamma_{\Delta\Lambda}$ the configuration space Christoffel symbols).

Upon inspection (see e.g. [7]), (20) simplifies for particular choices of parameter in 2 generally different ways (the two coincide if the potential is constant).

A)

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda} \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{W}{T}} \frac{dQ^\Delta}{d\lambda} \right\} = \frac{d^2 Q^\Delta}{d\lambda^2} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{WT}} \frac{dW}{d\lambda} \frac{dQ^\Delta}{d\lambda} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{dT}{d\lambda} \sqrt{\frac{W}{T^3}} \frac{dQ^\Delta}{d\lambda} \text{ versus } \frac{d^2 Q^\Gamma}{d\mu^2}$$

which corresponds to $\frac{d}{d\mu} = \sqrt{\frac{W}{T}} \frac{d}{d\lambda}$, which parameter μ we denote by $\mathfrak{t}^{\text{JBB}}$: emergent Jacobi–Barbour–Bertotti time [7, 9]. In the case of a mechanical theory, this emergent time turns out also to imply conservation of energy and amounts to a recovery of Newtonian time; it is also aligned with the mechanics case’s emergent semiclassical (WKB) time [17]. In the case of geometrodynamics (I use T in place of $\mathfrak{t}$ in this context), this emergent time amounts to a recovery of local proper time, as well as being aligned with the geometrodynamical emergent semiclassical (WKB) time [18], and corresponding to cosmic time in the case of homogeneous cosmology.

B) $\nabla^\Gamma W \neq 0$ versus $= 0$, the latter corresponding to ‘the dynamical curve being an affinely-parametrized geodesic on configuration space’. In this case I denote the time parameter by $\mathfrak{t}^{\text{aff-geo}}$.

Next, note the following properties.

1) The action (3) is banal-conformally invariant under

$$T \longrightarrow \tilde{T} = \Omega^2 T \quad , \quad W \longrightarrow \tilde{W} = W/\Omega^2 \quad : \quad (21)$$

$$\tilde{I} = 2 \int d\lambda \int_\Sigma d\Sigma \sqrt{\tilde{T}\tilde{W}} = 2 \int d\lambda \int_\Sigma d\Sigma \sqrt{\Omega^2 T W / \Omega^2} = 2 \int d\lambda \int_\Sigma d\Sigma \sqrt{T W} .$$

2) Subsequently, $d/d(\text{emergent time})$ is a banal-conformal covector,

$$\tilde{*} \equiv \sqrt{\tilde{W}/\tilde{T}} \circ = \sqrt{\{W/\Omega^2\}/\Omega^2 T} \circ = \Omega^{-2} \sqrt{W/T} \circ = \Omega^{-2} * .$$

Thus the emergent time [7, 33, 17] depends on the choice of banal-conformal factor. In the case of geometrodynamics, one can also think of $d/d\lambda$ being invariant and $1/\tilde{\Omega} = 1/\{\Omega^2 \circ I\}$ so that the velocity of the instant scales as a banal-conformal vector $\circ I \longrightarrow \Omega^2 \circ I$ (or, equivalently, the emergent lapse coordinate scales as a banal-conformal vector $N \longrightarrow \Omega^2 N$).

To not confuse ‘ $\mathfrak{t}^{\text{JBB}}$ as present in the previous literature’ and the banal covector discovered in this paper, I denote the latter by $\vec{\mathfrak{t}}$, rather. I also use the notation

$$* \equiv d/d\vec{\mathfrak{t}} = \sqrt{W/T} \circ .$$

3) Next observe that, provided that its timefunction scales as $\vec{\mathfrak{t}}$ does, the difference-type Euler–Lagrange action is also banal-conformally invariant (albeit in a more complicated way):

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{I} &= \int \int_\Sigma d\Sigma \{ \tilde{T}_{\mathfrak{t}} - \tilde{V} \} d\tilde{\mathfrak{t}} = \int \int_\Sigma d\Sigma \{ \tilde{M}_{\Gamma\Delta} \tilde{*}_g Q^\Gamma \tilde{*}_g Q^\Delta / 2 - \tilde{V} \} d\tilde{\mathfrak{t}} = \int \int_\Sigma d\Sigma \{ \Omega^2 M_{\Gamma\Delta} \Omega^{-2} *_g Q^\Gamma \Omega^{-2} *_g Q^\Delta / 2 - \Omega^{-2} V \} \Omega^2 d\vec{\mathfrak{t}} \\ &= \int \int_\Sigma d\Sigma \{ M_{\Gamma\Delta} *_g Q^\Gamma *_g Q^\Delta / 2 - V \} d\vec{\mathfrak{t}} = I . \end{aligned}$$

4) The Euler–Lagrange equations of motion following from (3), will clearly be invariant under the *full banal-conformal transformation* $(T, W, *) \longrightarrow (\tilde{T}, \tilde{W}, \tilde{*}) = (\Omega^2 T, \Omega^{-2} W, \Omega^{-2} *)$, as the action that they follow from is.

[Note that in the case of the relational formulation, the banal transformation of T, W directly implies the full banal transformation, so that these are not here distinct entities.]

This seemingly trivial extra fact does however generate some interesting comments when one looks at the details of the cancellations at the level of the Euler–Lagrange equations themselves.

Let us begin with the largely-sufficient finite and trivially spatially relational case (i.e. mechanics with temporal relationalism only, fully reduced 1- or 2-d relational particle mechanics and minisuperspace). Then the Euler–Lagrange equations are

$$D^2 Q^\Gamma / D\vec{\tau}^2 \equiv **Q^\Gamma + \Gamma^\Gamma_{\Lambda\Sigma} *Q^\Lambda *Q^\Sigma = \partial^\Gamma W, \quad (22)$$

which is the geodesic equation modulo the right-hand-side term ($D/D\vec{\tau}$ being the absolute derivative with respect to $\vec{\tau}$). The path of motion is not in general an affinely-parametrized geodesic [‘simplification B’], however a banal conformal transformation to a such exists, in the following sense.

Case 1: if W is prescribed as a constant, then (22) is the geodesic equation, which is the case in mechanics if V is constant and in (for the moment) minisuperspace GR if R is constant. Indeed, this corresponds to having an action proportional to $\int d\lambda \sqrt{T}$ and so to $\int ds$ for ds^2 the line-element corresponding to the kinetic metric $M_{\Gamma\Delta}$.

Case 2: if not, banal conformal-transform with $\Omega^2 = kW$ for k constant so $T \longrightarrow \tilde{T} = kWT$ and $W \longrightarrow \tilde{W} = W/kW = 1/k$. This corresponds to obtaining an action $I \propto \int d\tilde{s}$ and passing from τ^{JBB} to $\tau^{\text{aff-geo}}$, that is from banal conformal factor $\Omega^2 = 1$ to banal conformal factor $\Omega^2 = kW$. Thus simplifications A) and B) are related by a banal transformation. Moreover, case 2 has range of validity caveats [46, 61] for regions containing zeros of W as the conformal transformation’s definition precludes these; infinities and non-smoothnesses of W can likewise be disruptive. In the minisuperspace case, this paragraph’s contents were spelled out by Misner [46] following more partial mention in earlier work of DeWitt [62]. In mechanics, this is in e.g. [3, 7].

I then ask the following question. How does performing two transformations – conformal transformation and non-affine parametrization – each of which complicates the equations of motion, nevertheless work out to preserve them when applied together?

Understanding this requires looking at the alternative, longer proof of 4) at the level of the equations of motion themselves. By

$$\tilde{\Gamma}^\Gamma_{\Delta\Lambda} = \Gamma^\Gamma_{\Delta\Lambda} + \{2\delta^\Gamma_{(\Delta}\partial_{\Lambda)}\Omega - M_{\Delta\Lambda}\partial^\Gamma\Omega\}/\Omega,$$

symmetry and the definition of $T_{\vec{\tau}}$ in terms of velocities with respect to $\vec{\tau}$,

$$\tilde{\Gamma}^\Gamma_{\Delta\Lambda} *Q^\Delta *Q^\Lambda = \Omega^{-4} \Gamma^\Gamma_{\Delta\Lambda} *Q^\Delta *Q^\Lambda + 2\Omega^{-5} \{\partial_\Delta \Omega *Q^\Delta *Q^\Lambda - T_{\vec{\tau}} \partial^\Gamma \Omega\},$$

which, then, alongside using obvious product rule expressions for $*\{\Omega^{-2} *Q^\Gamma\}$ and $\partial^\Gamma\{\Omega^{-2}W\}$ gives

$$0 = **Q^\Gamma + \tilde{\Gamma}^\Gamma_{\Lambda\Delta} *Q^\Delta *Q^\Lambda - \tilde{\partial}^\Gamma \tilde{W} = \Omega^{-4} \{**Q^\Gamma + \Gamma^\Gamma_{\Lambda\Delta} *Q^\Delta *Q^\Lambda - \partial^\Gamma W\} + 2\Omega^{-5} \{\partial_\Delta \Omega *Q^\Delta *Q^\Gamma + \{W - T_{\vec{\tau}}\} \partial_\Gamma \Omega\}. \quad (23)$$

Then the second big bracket cancels by the chain rule and conservation of energy in mechanics: $W - T_{\vec{\tau}} = E - V - T_{\vec{\tau}}$ or the Lagrangian form of the Hamiltonian constraint in (for the moment) minisuperspace GR: $W - T_{\text{GR}} = \text{Ric}(h) - 2\Lambda - T_{\text{GR}}$.

Next, analyze the above in terms of non-affine parametrization and conformal transformation subworkings. This reveals the second term in the second large bracket to be the result of non-affine parametrization. It cancels with the first term, which is one of two complicating terms from conformal transformation, the other one being the $T_{\vec{\tau}}$, which itself cancels with the banal conformal transformation’s compensatory conformal scaling of $W = E - V$ by the conservation of energy or the Hamiltonian constraint. This is therefore an interesting configuration space generalization of the result by which null geodesics conformally map to null geodesics [47]. There, the first conformal complication is balanced by a change of what is the suitable affine parametrization, while the second one vanishes by the geodesic being null with respect to the indefinite spacetime metric. In our case, the first of these cancellations continues to occur with the same interpretation, but what was the null combination (and thus working for indefinite metrics only) becomes, in the configuration space context, the kinetic term whether for indefinite or definite kinetic metrics, and the null condition becomes replaced by the energy or Hamiltonian constraint (granted the banal conformal transformation’s compensatory scaling of the potential factor W). Thus ‘in indefinite spaces null geodesics conformal-map to null geodesics’ becomes ‘in configuration spaces of whatever signature, paths of motion banal-conformal map to paths of motion’.

Let us now afford a slight generalization to finite models with non-trivial spatial relationalism. At least Euclidean and similarity relational particle mechanics then have as equations of motion

$$D_g^2 Q^\Gamma / D\vec{\tau}^2 \equiv *_g *_g Q^\Gamma + \Gamma^\Gamma_{\Lambda\Sigma} *_g Q^\Lambda *_g Q^\Sigma = \partial^\Gamma W, \quad (24)$$

for $D_g/D\vec{\tau}$ the G-gauged absolute derivative, and then the preceding analysis carries through under $* \longrightarrow *_g$. To the extent that the previous paths of motion were geodesics, the current paths are ‘geodesics provided that we suitably align the constituent snapshots by auxiliary G-transformations’.

We have determined that solely non-affinely parametrizing or solely rescaling the kinetic metric complicate the equations of motion away from the simple form (22) or (24) that using emergent Jacobi–Barbour–Bertotti time places them in, while performing both of these operations alongside the compensating W rescaling preserves this simple form, choice of emergent time indeed being nonunique up to this ‘banal’ freedom. Thus, if one’s problem requires rescaling or non-affinely parametrizing, one’s problem may permit one to ‘complete’ the required transformation to a full banal conformal

transformation, whereby the effect of solely rescaling or solely non-affinely parametrizing kicking one out of the form (22) or (24) is circumvented, and so emergent time's being a banal covector leads to a robustness result for its property of giving simple equations of motion.

Preservation under full banal transformation means that $\tilde{\tau}$ corresponding to any Ω carries out simplification A). One can then pick $\Omega^2 = kW$ so that $\partial^\Gamma \tilde{W} = \partial^\Gamma k = 0$, and then $\tilde{*} = \Omega^{-2}* = \{kW^{-1}\}* = \{k\sqrt{WT}\}^{-1}\circ$; i.e. so that simplification B) – taking affine geodesic form rather than additionally containing a $\partial^\Gamma W$ term – *also* holds. Thus one has gone from physics with a restricted class of affine parameters under which the equations of motion take the form (22) or (24) to physics with a restricted class of banal conformal factors under which the equations of motion take geodesic form. Each of these, moreover, is nonunique up to a constant multiplicative time-scale (evident in the specification of the geodesic equation forming Ω) and an additive constant time-origin (evident since what a power of Ω scales is $d/d\tilde{\tau}$ and so $\tilde{\tau}$ itself has an additive constant of integration more freedom than Ω itself [17, 18]). These retain one's civilization's freedom of choice for calendar year zero and unit of time, as should be the case.

Finally, affine transformations send $\mathbf{t}_{\text{old}}$ to $\mathbf{t}_{\text{new}}(\mathbf{t}_{\text{old}})$ subject to

I) nonfreezing and monotonicity, so $d\mathbf{t}_{\text{new}}/d\mathbf{t}_{\text{old}} > 0$ which can be encoded by having it be a square of a quantity Q with no zeros in the region of use, and

II) this derivative and hence Q being a physically-reasonable function (to stop the transition damaging the equations of motion). But this can be recast as $d/d\mathbf{t}_{\text{new}} = Q^{-2}d/d\mathbf{t}_{\text{old}}$, by which (and other properties matching⁶) we are free to identify this Q with Ω , so any affine transformation is of a form that extends to a (full) banal conformal transformation. If one then chooses to ‘complete’ it to a full banal conformal transformation, the above calculation can be interpreted as the extra non-affine term being traded for a T term by having an accompanying conformal transformation of the kinetic metric, and then this being traded for $\partial^\Gamma W$ by energy conservation and the compensating banal conformal transformation of W . Thus the freedom to affinely-transform the geodesic equation on configuration space can be viewed instead as the freedom to (fully) banal-conformally transform a system's equation of motion. *Thus the relational approach's simplicity notion for equations of motion has the same mathematical content as prescribing an affine rather than non-affine parameter for the geodesic equation on configuration space.* Thus the banally related $\tilde{\tau}$ corresponds to ‘the set of (generally) nonaffine parameters for the geodesic-like equation of motion on configuration space’, while $\mathbf{t}^{\text{aff-geo}}$ indeed remains identified with the much more restricted set (unique up to a multiplicative constant time-scale and an additive constant time-origin) of affine parameters for the geodesic equation on configuration space.

Then part of the argument for emergent time being fixed by the universe's contents” [7] is lost as it is revealed to contain an arbitrary factor. But one can then get back that preciseness by making a choice. $\mathbf{t}^{\text{JBB}}$ ($\Omega = 1$, so that E carries no nonconstant factors) and $\mathbf{t}^{\text{aff-geo}}$ are then interesting such choices.

5) In preparation for the passage to QM in Sec 3, the conjugate momenta are the banal-conformal invariant expressions

$$\tilde{P}_\Delta = \sqrt{\tilde{W}/\tilde{T}}\tilde{M}_{\Gamma\Delta}\circ_g q^\Gamma = \tilde{M}_{\Gamma\Delta}\tilde{*}_g Q^\Gamma = M_{\Gamma\Delta}*_g Q^\Gamma = P_\Delta . \quad (25)$$

Thus what does banal-scale concerns, a fortiori, configuration space rather than phase space.

6) One obtains as a primary constraint resultant from the reparametrization invariance of the action a quadratic constraint (7). Now, as $N^{\Gamma\Delta}$ is the inverse of $M_{\Gamma\Delta}$, it scales as a banal-conformal covector

$$N^{\Gamma\Delta} \longrightarrow \tilde{N}^{\Gamma\Delta} = \Omega^{-2}N^{\Gamma\Delta} . \quad (26)$$

Combining (25) and (26), the quadratic constraint (7) is a banal covector.

7) In cases with nontrivial configurational relationalism there are also linear constraints from variation with respect to G-auxiliaries (Sec 1.2). By (25) the linear momentum constraint of GR, $\mathcal{L}_\mu$, and the relational particle mechanics constraints, $\underline{P}$, $\underline{L}$ and $\underline{D}$, are banal-conformally invariant.

8) The mechanics Hamiltonian H is the left hand side of the quadratic energy constraint (7) and as such scales as a banal covector. One then integrates this with respect to $\tilde{t}$. If one looks to extend this prescription to relational particle mechanics, given that the linear constraints are banal-conformally invariant, one finds that one needs to either: build the total almost-Hamiltonian⁷ by using $*\underline{a}$ and $*\underline{b}$ (and $-*c$ in the similarity case) as the appending auxiliaries to preserve homogeneity of banal transformation:

$$A_{\text{total}} = H + *\underline{a} \cdot \underline{P} + *\underline{b} \cdot \underline{L} \quad (- *cD) . \quad (27)$$

Or, have H carry a ‘lapse’ prefactor $d\tilde{T}/d\lambda$ and then use $\circ\underline{a}$ and $\circ\underline{b}$ (and $-\circ c$ in the similarity case) as the appending auxiliaries, producing an almost-Hamiltonian that is now banal-conformally invariant,

$$\bar{A}_{\text{total}} = \circ\tilde{T}H + \circ\underline{a} \cdot \underline{P} + \circ\underline{b} \cdot \underline{L} \quad (- \circ cD) . \quad (28)$$

⁶It may be interesting to find out whether the one restricts the other's function space more than usual.

⁷Total Hamiltonians have constraints appended by Lagrange multiplier coordinates. In the cyclic velocity auxiliary picture that relationalism instead implies, one has rather what I term an almost-Hamiltonian [44] with cyclic velocities in place of multipliers, which terminology I use since velocities still appear in it, albeit only the velocities of *auxiliary* quantities.

These two views are, moreover, physically equivalent, since the first is to be integrated over $\vec{T}$ and the second over λ .

For GR, $\mathcal{H}$ scales as a banal covector and the velocity of the instant, OI (or the lapse, α) as a banal vector. Thus it is entirely straightforward to append the banal-scalar $\mathcal{H}_\mu$ using the banal-scalar auxiliary OF^μ (or β^μ), to make either the relational total GR almost-Hamiltonian

$$\mathbf{A}_{\text{total}}^{\text{GR}} = \int d^3x \{ \text{OI} \mathcal{H} + \text{OF}^\mu \mathcal{L}_\mu \} , \quad (29)$$

or the Arnowitt–Deser–Misner total GR Hamiltonian

$$\mathbf{H}_{\text{total}}^{\text{GR}} = \int d^3x \{ \alpha \mathcal{H} + \beta^\mu \mathcal{L}_\mu \} . \quad (30)$$

[Comparing the last two paragraphs, relational particle mechanics likewise admit Hamiltonians if formulated partially non-relationally by use of multiplier coordinates in place of their cyclic velocities. Also note that GR comes already-parametrized, so there is no primed-unprimed ambiguity therein.]

3 Banal-invariance in finite QM (relational mechanics, minisuperspace)

At the quantum level, those constraints which remain become wave equations. In this paper's models, this always includes a quadratic constraint of form (7). This contains a product of P_Γ and Q^Γ terms, $N^{\Gamma\Delta}(Q^\Lambda)P_\Gamma P_\Delta$, which picks up ordering issues in passing to QM. Assume that $Q^\Gamma \longrightarrow \hat{Q}^\Gamma = Q^\Gamma$, $P_\Gamma \longrightarrow \hat{P}_\Gamma = -i\hbar\partial_\Gamma$.

I first consider the more widely well-defined finite case, but leave the working in a general notation that covers both relational particle mechanics and minisuperspace. The *Laplacian ordering* at the QM level of the classical $N^{\Gamma\Delta}(Q^\Lambda)P_\Gamma P_\Delta$ combination is

$$D^2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \frac{\partial}{\partial Q^\Gamma} \left\{ \sqrt{M} N^{\Gamma\Delta} \frac{\partial}{\partial Q^\Delta} \right\} . \quad (31)$$

This has the desirable property of (straightforwardly) being independent of coordinate choice on the configuration space $\mathbf{Q}$ [49]. This property is not, however, unique to this ordering; one can reorder to include a Ricci scalar curvature term so as to have $D^2 - \xi \text{Ric}(M)$ [49, 46, 52, 59, 53, 54, 56, 55]. It is then well-known [47] that there is a unique choice of ξ (dependent on the dimension $k \geq 2$ of the mathematical space in question⁸) that leads to the production of a conformally-invariant operator and hence of a conformally-invariant operator-ordering in the quantum application [46, 52, 59, 53, 54, 56, 55]. Moreover, in the present paper I identify this conformal invariance associated with operator ordering as being the same as the banal-conformal invariance that is simple and natural in classical relational product-type actions, whereby demanding this operator ordering can be seen as asking to extend this simple and natural invariance to hold also at the quantum level. The operator with the desired properties is, specifically,

$$D_{\text{C}}^2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \frac{\partial}{\partial Q^\Gamma} \left\{ \sqrt{M} N^{\Gamma\Delta} \frac{\partial}{\partial Q^\Delta} \right\} - \frac{k-2}{4\{k-1\}} \text{Ric}(M) \quad (32)$$

where k is the dimension of $\mathbf{Q}$. Moreover, this operator by itself is still not banal-conformally invariant: it is furthermore required that the wavefunction of the universe Ψ that it acts upon itself transforms in general tensorially under $\mathbf{Q}$ -conformal transformations [47],

$$\Psi \longrightarrow \tilde{\Psi} = \Omega^{\frac{2-k}{2}} \Psi . \quad (33)$$

Some simpler cases are as follows.

- 1) For models with 2-d configuration spaces such as for the minisuperspace models [52, 56, 57, 58], quantum similarity relational particle mechanics of 3 particles in the plane [28, 30] or of 4 particles on the line [29], and of 3 particles on the line with scale [36, 23], the conformal value of $\xi = \{k-2\}/4\{k-1\}$ collapses to zero, so that Laplacian ordering and conformally invariant wavefunctions suffice.
- 2) For models with zero Ricci scalar, the conformal ordering coincides with the Laplacian one. E.g. banal-conformally flat models can be arranged to have this, of which the Euclidean relational particle mechanics of 3 particles in the plane [21] or of N particles on a line [23] are examples.
- 3) If a space has constant Ricci scalar, then the effect of a $\xi \text{Ric}(M)$ term, conformal or otherwise, is just something which can be absorbed into redefining the energy in the case of mechanics. In particular, this is the case for relational particle mechanics in 1-d as their configuration spaces are $\mathbb{S}^{N-2}$ which are clearly of constant curvature, and for relational

⁸I exclude 1-d configuration spaces as physics concerns changes of one configurational variable with respect to another physical variable, in which sense configuration space dimension ≥ 2 is required. This is the case at the classical level, without it internal time makes no sense and it is also needed at the quantum level, at least for such as [29] the semiclassical approach and records theory approach to the Problem of Time in Quantum Cosmology.

particle mechanics in 2-d as their configuration spaces are $\mathbb{CP}^{N-2}$ which are Einstein [16] and hence of constant Ricci scalar curvature. Parallely, were the Ricci scalar constant in a GR model, it could likewise be absorbed into redefining the cosmological constant.

However, almost all other minisuperspace models and relational particle mechanics models (e.g. [24]) have configuration space dimension ≥ 3 for which the choice of a value of ξ is required. The present paper is written partly in support of the choice of ordering made in [28, 29, 24] and more complicated relational particle mechanics (see e.g. [16]).

Next, if one sends $H\Psi = E\Psi$ to $\tilde{H}\tilde{\Psi} = \tilde{E}\tilde{\Psi} = \{E/\Omega^2\}\tilde{\Psi}$, one's eigenvalue problem has a weight function Ω^{-2} which then appears in the inner product:

$$\int_{\Sigma} \tilde{\Psi}_1^* \tilde{\Psi}_2 \Omega^{-2} \sqrt{M} d^k x . \quad (34)$$

This inner product additionally succeeds in being banal-conformally invariant, being equal to (c.f. [46] for the minisuperspace case)

$$\int_{\Sigma} \Psi_1^* \Omega^{\frac{2-k}{2}} \Psi_2 \Omega^{\frac{2-k}{2}} \Omega^{-2} \sqrt{M} \Omega^k d^k x = \int_{\Sigma} \Psi_1^* \Psi_2 \sqrt{M} d^k x \quad (35)$$

in the banal representation that is mechanically natural in the sense that E comes with the trivial weight function, 1.

Generally, $\hat{H} = \tilde{\tilde{H}}$ is not in a simple sense self-adjoint with respect to $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$, while the mechanically-natural $\hat{H}$ is, in a simple sense, with respect to $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$. More precisely, this is in the sense that

$$\int \sqrt{M} d^k x \Psi^* D^2 \Psi = \int \sqrt{M} d^k x \{D^2 \Psi^*\} \Psi + \text{boundary terms} , \quad (36)$$

which amounts to self-adjointness if the boundary terms can be arranged to be zero, whether by the absence of boundaries in the configuration spaces for 1 and 2 dimensional relational particle mechanics [16] or by the usual kind of suitable fall-off conditions on Ψ . This is not shared by the Ω -inner product as that has an extra factor of Ω^{-2} , which in general interferes with the corresponding move by the product rule ($\sqrt{M}$ does not interfere thus above, since the Laplacian is built out of derivatives that are covariant with respect to the metric $M_{\Gamma\Delta}$.) However, on the premise that solving $\tilde{H}\tilde{\Psi} = \tilde{E}\tilde{\Psi}$ is equivalent to solving $H\Psi = E\Psi$, the banal-conformal transformation might at this level be viewed as a sometimes-useful computational aid, with the answer then being placed in the preceding paragraph's banal representation for further physical interpretation.

What about the case of theories with further, linear constraints? In the case of relational particle mechanics, choosing conformal ordering before and after dealing with the linear constraints do not appear to agree in general (so that arguing for conformal ordering by itself is not a guarantee of unambiguously fixing an ordering). As I consider the structure of the configuration space to impart lucid knowledge whenever the reduction can be done, I would favour performing the reduction and then conformal-ordering the reduced configuration space Hamiltonian, as in [28, 24, 29]. In the Dirac quantization approach for relational particle mechanics ('quantize then constrain'), N.B. that sending $P\Psi = 0$ to $\tilde{P}\tilde{\Psi}$ does cause an alteration as P is a differential operator. The same is the case for the zero total angular momentum constraint L and the dilational constraint D . On the other hand, the reduced quantization approach ('constrain and then quantize') is free of this issue.

Barvinsky [58] investigated for what ordering these two approaches coincide. On the other hand, e.g. Ashtekar, Horowitz, Romano and Tate [63] have argued for inequivalence of these two approaches to quantization. In any case, to 1 loop (first order in $\hbar$) Barvinsky argues that the Laplacian ordering will do the trick. Then, as the $\xi \text{Ric}(M)$ term contributes only to $O(\hbar^2)$ so that conformal ordering will likewise do to get equivalence between Dirac and reduced quantization equivalence to 1 loop.

4 Comments on quantum geometrodynamics itself

Sec 3 contains the use of conformal ordering in minisuperspace, which I would argue is already an important and useful case on which there is substantial literature. For infinite theories like GR, one has not an ordinary but a *functional* Laplacian,

$$\mathcal{D}^2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \frac{\delta}{\delta Q^\Gamma} \left\{ \sqrt{M} N^{\Gamma\Delta} \frac{\delta}{\delta Q^\Delta} \right\} . \quad (37)$$

Using this as one's ordering for $N^{\Gamma\Delta}(Q^\Lambda) \mathcal{P}_\Gamma \mathcal{P}_\Delta$ continues to have the desirable property of being independent of the coordinate choice on the configuration space. As before, this property is not, however, unique to this ordering: one can include a Ricci scalar curvature term so as to have $\mathcal{D}^2 - \xi \text{Ric}(M)$. Proceeding analogously to before, there is then a unique banal-conformally invariant choice among these orderings:

$$\mathcal{D}_c^2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \frac{\delta}{\delta Q^\Gamma} \left\{ \sqrt{M} N^{\Gamma\Delta} \frac{\delta}{\delta Q^\Delta} \right\} - \frac{k-2}{4\{k-1\}} \text{Ric}(M) , \quad (38)$$

so long as Ψ itself transforms in general tensorially under the conformal transformation

$$\Psi \longrightarrow \tilde{\Psi} = \Omega^{\frac{2-k}{2}} \Psi . \quad (39)$$

There is now a snag in that k is infinite so (39) becomes ill-defined; however in the operator (38) the coefficient of $\text{Ric}(M)$ merely tends to $1/4$, while the cancellation of k in working (35) also continues to hold in this case, and it is the outcome of this (including its operator expectation counterpart), rather than Ψ itself, that has physical meaning. This gives a Wheeler–DeWitt equation of the form

$$\hbar^2 \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathcal{M}}} \frac{\delta}{\delta h_{\mu\nu}} \left\{ \sqrt{\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{N}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \frac{\delta}{\delta h_{\rho\sigma}} \right\} - \frac{1}{4} \text{Ric}(\mathcal{M}) \right\} \Psi + \sqrt{\hbar} \{ \text{Ric}(h) - 2\Lambda \} \Psi = 0 . \quad (40)$$

Also in full GR, due to the presence of the linear momentum constraint and the previous Sec’s insight from relational particle mechanics’ analogous linear constraints, conformal order before and after reduction may differ given the insight from the relational particle mechanics toy models. Moreover one cannot in general perform the reduction here, so the conformal order within the Dirac-type quantization scheme may be questionable.

5 Conclusion

Mechanics and fundamental physics at the classical level can be considered in terms of temporally relational product-type actions, and doing so is useful in considering whole-universe situations – the setting for quantum cosmology. These readily exhibit a banal-conformal invariance under compensating rescalings of the configuration space metric and the potential (alongside the total energy in the case of mechanics). The classical equations of motion resulting from product-type actions simplify for a particular form of emergent time. In mechanics, this amounts to a recovery of Newtonian time from relational premises, while in GR this amounts to a recovery of proper time or cosmic time in the various contexts where relevant. In this paper, we found that this emergent time itself scales when a banal conformal transformation is performed. Then how a more complicated manifestation of banal-conformal invariance is present in the more commonly used difference-type actions can be deduced, provided that the notions of time in these scale in the same way as the emergent time does. I also clarified that the simplifying effects on the equations of motion through use of the emergent time (e.g. Jacobi–Barbour–Bertotti time) and those through use of affine parametrization of geodesics and dynamical trajectories are linked via a straightforward (albeit apparently hard to spot) working hinging on conservation of energy.

Suppose then that one chooses to retain this banal-conformal invariance – simple and natural from the perspective of relational product actions at the classical level – upon passing to the quantum level. Furthermore, let the theoretically-desirable and fairly standard tenet that quantum mechanics be independent of choice of coordinates on configuration space $\mathcal{Q}$ be adhered to. Then these combine to pick out the operator ordering based on the conformally-invariant modification of the Laplacian. While this operator ordering has been suggested by others previously (as documented in Sec 1.3), this is the first paper pointing out the relational underpinning for it. As how one operator-orders has consequences for the physical predictions of one’s theory, and there is no established way to prescribe the operator ordering in the case of (toy models of) quantum gravity, this stronger motivation for conformal ordering is of wide interest.⁹

As regards applications to simple toy models, for 2-d configuration spaces, conformal ordering becomes indistinguishable from the also sometimes advocated Laplacian ordering, while the difference becomes minor for manifolds with constant Ricci scalar. Nor is there any distinction between these to 1 loop in the semiclassical approach. However, more complicated modelling situations [24, 16] do have a distinction between Laplacian and conformal orderings. What is conformal ordering depends in detail (to more than 1 loop) on whether one Dirac-quantizes or reduced-quantizes. This distinction is already visible in finite but linearly-constrained relational particle models.

Inner products, which are the directly physically meaningful constructs in quantum theory, are found to be suitably banal-conformally invariant. Taking these to be primary, that the scaling of the waverfunction itself (required for the conformal modification of the Laplacian operator to actually form a conformally invariant combination) is formally infinite in cases with infinite configuration space dimensions, appears unproblematic. In particular, this suggests an ordering for the Wheeler-DeWitt equation of full geometrodynamics.

Acknowledgments I thank Visiting Prof Julian Barbour, Dr Harvey Brown and Ms Anne Franzen for discussions.

⁹There does remain the caveat that QM in general and Quantum Gravity in particular may have other restrictions on orderings from such as well-defined existence and self-adjointness of quantum Hamiltonians and of other important quantum operators. Then possibly another such technical condition could turn out to be incompatible with conformal ordering at least for some theories/models, but to the best of our knowledge, to date nobody has found any such.

References

- [1] E. Anderson, Phys. Rev. **D68** 104001 (2003), gr-qc/0302035.
- [2] E. Anderson, Stud. Hist. Phil. Mod. Phys. **38** 15 (2007), gr-qc/0511070.
- [3] C. Lanczos, *The Variational Principles of Mechanics* (University of Toronto Press, Toronto 1949).
- [4] I. Newton, *Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica* (1686 and later editions). For an English translation, see e.g. I.B. Cohen and A. Whitman (University of California Press, Berkeley 1999). In particular, see the Scholium on absolute motion therein.
- [5] *The Leibniz–Clark correspondence* ed. H.G. Alexander (Manchester University Press, Manchester 1956);
 Bishop G. Berkeley *The Principles of Human Knowledge* (1710);
 Bishop G. Berkeley *Concerning Motion (De Motu)* (1721);
 E. Mach, *Die Mechanik in ihrer Entwicklung, Historisch-kritisch dargestellt* (J.A. Barth, Leipzig 1883). An English translation is *The Science of Mechanics: A Critical and Historical Account of its Development* (Open Court, La Salle, Ill. 1960);
 J.B. Barbour, in *Quantum Concepts in Space and Time* ed. R. Penrose and C.J. Isham (Oxford University Press, Oxford 1986);
 J.B. Barbour, *Absolute or Relative Motion? Vol 1: The Discovery of Dynamics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1989);
Mach’s principle: From Newton’s Bucket to Quantum Gravity ed. J.B. Barbour and H. Pfister (Birkhäuser, Boston 1995);
 O. Pooley, <http://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/archive/00000221/index.html>;
 O. Pooley, in *Chronos (Proceedings of the Philosophy of Time Society)* (2003-04);
 O. Pooley and H.R. Brown, Brit. J. Phil. Sci. **53**, 183 (2002);
 J.B. Barbour, in J.N. Butterfield (ed.), *The Arguments of Time* (Oxford University Press, New York 1999);
 J.N. Butterfield, Brit. J. Phil. Sci. **53**, 289 (2002), gr-qc/0103055;
 L. Smolin, in R. Durie (ed.) *Time and the instant* (Clinamen Press, Manchester 2000);
 J.B. Barbour, forthcoming book.
- [6] J.B. Barbour and B. Bertotti, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. **A382** 295 (1982).
- [7] J.B. Barbour, Class. Quantum Grav. **11** 2853 (1994).
- [8] J.B. Barbour, *The End of Time* (Oxford University Press, Oxford 1999).
- [9] J.B. Barbour, B.Z. Foster and N. Ó Murchadha, Class. Quantum Grav. **19** 3217 (2002), gr-qc/0012089.
- [10] J.B. Barbour, arXiv:0903.3489.
- [11] In fact, I have found evidence that this feature of varying Jacobi-type actions has been known for longer, see e.g. p 188-189 of N.I. Akhiezer *The Calculus of Variations* (Blaisdell, New York 1962) for an English translation of an earlier Russian work.
- [12] C. Rovelli, *Quantum Gravity* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2004).
- [13] See e.g. C.W. Misner, K. Thorne and J.A. Wheeler, *Gravitation* (Freedman, San Francisco 1973).
- [14] E. Anderson and J.B. Barbour, Class. Quantum Grav. **19** 3249 (2002), gr-qc/0201092;
 E. Anderson, J.B. Barbour, B.Z. Foster and N. Ó Murchadha, Class. Quantum Grav. **20** 157 (2003), gr-qc/0211022;
 E. Anderson, in *General Relativity Research Trends, Horizons in World Physics* **249** ed. A. Reimer (Nova, New York 2005), gr-qc/0405022;
 E. Anderson, “Geometrodynamics: Spacetime or Space?” (Ph.D. Thesis, University of London 2004), gr-qc/0409123;
 E. Anderson, J.B. Barbour, B.Z. Foster, B. Kelleher and N. Ó Murchadha, Class. Quantum Grav. **22** 1795 (2005), gr-qc/0407104.
- [15] J.B. Barbour, Class. Quantum Grav. **20** 1543 (2003), gr-qc/0211021.
- [16] E. Anderson, Class. Quantum Grav. **25** 025003 (2008), arXiv:0706.3934.
- [17] E. Anderson, Class. Quantum Grav. **24** 2935 (2007), gr-qc/0611007.
- [18] E. Anderson, Class. Quantum Grav. **24** 2971 (2007), gr-qc/0611008.
- [19] L.Á Gergely, Class. Quantum Grav. **17** 1949 (2000), gr-qc/0003064;
 L.Á Gergely and M. McKain, Class. Quantum Grav. **17** 1963 (2000), gr-qc/0003065;
 E. Anderson, Class. Quant. Grav. **23** 2469 (2006), gr-qc/0511068.
- [20] E. Anderson, AIP Conf. Proc. **861** 285 (2006), gr-qc/0509054;
 E. Anderson, Class. Quantum Grav. **24** 5317 (2007), gr-qc/0702083.
- [21] E. Anderson, Class. Quantum Grav. **26** 135020 (2009), arXiv:0809.1168.
- [22] E. Anderson, “Relational Mechanics Models of Shape and Scale”, forthcoming.
- [23] E. Anderson, “Quantum mechanics of Shape and Scale: N particles on a line”, forthcoming.
- [24] E. Anderson, “TriangleLand. III. Quantum Mechanics of Shape and Scale”, forthcoming.

- [25] E. Anderson, forthcoming.
- [26] J.B. Barbour, in *Decoherence and Entropy in Complex Systems (Proceedings of the Conference DICE, Piombino 2002)* ed. H-T. Elze, Springer Lecture Notes in Physics 2003), gr-qc/0309089.
- [27] E. Anderson, Class. Quant. Grav. **23** 2491 (2006), gr-qc/0511069.
- [28] E. Anderson, Class. Quantum Grav. **26** 135021 (2009), arXiv:0809.3523.
- [29] E. Anderson and A. Franzen, “Quantum Cosmological Metroland Model”, forthcoming.
- [30] E. Anderson, “Zodiac Tessellation and Shape Operators: Improved Interpretation of Quantum Cosmological TriangleLand”, forthcoming.
- [31] J.B. Barbour and L. Smolin, unpublished, dating from 1989.
- [32] K.V. Kuchař, in *Proceedings of the 4th Canadian Conference on General Relativity and Relativistic Astrophysics* ed. G. Kunstatter, D. Vincent and J. Williams (World Scientific, Singapore 1992).
- [33] J.B. Barbour, Class. Quantum Grav. **11** 2875 (1994).
- [34] C. Kiefer, *Quantum Gravity* 2nd Edition (Clarendon, Oxford 2007).
- [35] E. Anderson, accepted by Int. J. Mod. Phys. **D**, arXiv:0709.1892;
E. Anderson, in *Proceedings of the Second Conference on Time and Matter*, ed. M. O’Loughlin, S. Stanič and D. Veberič (University of Nova Gorica Press, Nova Gorica, Slovenia 2008), arXiv:0711.3174;
E. Anderson, “What is the Distance Between Two Shapes?”, forthcoming;
E. Anderson, forthcoming papers.
- [36] E. Anderson, arXiv0908.1983;
E. Anderson, forthcoming.
- [37] L. Smolin, Lecture Course on the Problem of Time, available in video form at <http://pirsa.org/C08003>.
- [38] J.B. Barbour and B.Z. Foster, arXiv:0808.1223;
S.B. Gryb, arXiv:0804.2900;
S.B. Gryb, arXiv:0810.4152, Class. Quantum Grav. **26** 085015 (2009).
- [39] C.J. Isham, in *Integrable Systems, Quantum Groups and Quantum Field Theories* ed. L.A. Ibort and M.A. Rodríguez (Kluwer, Dordrecht 1993), gr-qc/9210011.
- [40] B.S. DeWitt, Phys. Rev. **160** 1113 (1967).
- [41] C.W. Misner, Phys. Rev **186** 1319 (1969);
C.W. Misner, in *Relativity (Proceedings of the relativity conference in the Midwest, held at Cincinnati, Ohio June 2-6, 1969)* ed. M. Carmeli, S.I. Fickler and L. Witten (Plenum, New York 1970);
J.B. Hartle and S.W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. **D28** 2960 (1983);
P.D. D’Eath, *Supersymmetric Quantum Cosmology* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1996);
- [42] D.L. Wiltshire, in *Cosmology: the Physics of the Universe* ed. B. Robson, N. Visvanathan and W.S. Woolcock (World Scientific, Singapore 1996), gr-qc/0101003.
- [43] R. Baierlein, D. Sharp, and J.A. Wheeler, Phys. Rev. **126**, 1864 (1962).
- [44] E. Anderson, Class. Quantum Grav. **25** 175011 (2008), arXiv:0711.0288.
- [45] R. Arnowitt, S. Deser and C. Misner, in *Gravitation: An Introduction to Current Research* ed. L. Witten (Wiley, New York 1962).
- [46] C.W. Misner, in *Magic Without Magic: John Archibald Wheeler*, ed. J.R. Klauder (Freeman, San Francisco, 1972).
- [47] See e.g. R.M. Wald, *General Relativity* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1984).
- [48] See e.g. J. Stewart, *Advanced General Relativity* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1991).
- [49] B.S. DeWitt, Rev. Mod. Phys. **29** 377 (1957).
- [50] K.V. Kuchař, in *Relativity, Astrophysics and Cosmology* ed. W. Israel (Reidel, Dordrecht 1973).
- [51] M. Henneaux, M. Pilati and C. Teitelboim, Phys. Lett. **110B** 123 (1982).
- [52] S.W. Hawking and D.N. Page, Nucl. Phys. **B264** 185 (1986).
- [53] J.J. Halliwell, Phys. Rev. **D38** 2468 (1988).
- [54] I. Moss, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré **49** 341 (1988).
- [55] M.P. Ryan and A.V. Turbiner, Phys. Lett. **A333** 30 (2004), quant-ph/0406167.
- [56] D.N. Page, J. Math. Phys. **32** 3427 (1991).
- [57] J. Louko, Ann. Phys. **181** 318 (1988).

- [58] A.O. Barvinsky and V. Krykhtin, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **10** 1957 (1993);
A.O. Barvinsky, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **10** 1985 (1993);
A.O. Barvinsky, *Phys. Rep.* **10** 237 (1993).
- [59] T. Christodoulakis and J. Zanelli, *Nuovo Cim.* **B93** 1 (1986).
- [60] K. Kuchař *J. Math. Phys.* **19** 390 (1978);
T. Thiemann, *Modern Canonical Quantum General Relativity* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007).
- [61] See e.g. A. Burd and R. Tavakol, *Phys. Rev. D* **47** 5336 (1993).
- [62] B.S. DeWitt, in *Relativity (Proceedings of the Relativity Conference in the Midwest, held at Cincinnati, Ohio June 2-6, 1969)* ed. M. Carmeli, S.I. Fickler and L. Witten (Plenum, New York 1970).
- [63] A. Ashtekar and G. Horowitz, *J. Math. Phys.* **25** 1473 (1984);
J.D. Romano and R.S. Tate, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **6** 1487 (1989).